

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-9 remain pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1 and 4 have been amended. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed.

Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Viswanath *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 7,350,698), hereafter “Viswanath.” Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Viswanath in view of Okada (U.S. Patent No. 6,910,018), hereafter “Okada.”

A. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5 AND 7-9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection over Viswanath, Applicants assert that Viswanath does not disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that Viswanath fails to disclose displaying a view containing a set of item requests to the approver containing all item requests for all requestors for which approval is requested from the approver, the set of item requests including a plurality of item requests from a plurality of requesters. In its argument to the contrary, the Office cites Fig. 8 and the accompanying text in the Viswanath. However, the figure of Viswanath cited by the Office displays only a single requester, that is Bugs Bunny 1 Hare. Furthermore, Viswanath does not state that the line items in Fig. 8 represent all requests for which approval is requested from

this approver. Rather, the passages of Viswanath cited by the Office describe the line items in Fig. 8 as line items in a single purchase requisition. The claimed invention, in contrast, includes an expressly claimed ability to display a view containing a set of item requests to the approver containing all item requests for which approval is requested from the approver, the set of item requests including a plurality of item requests from a plurality of requesters. Thus, the single, multi-part purchase requisition from the single requester in Viswanath fails to disclose the view displayed by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With further respect to independent claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references also fail to teach or suggest automatically determining the approver and a subsequent approver from a hierarchy of approvers based on an item in the item request and automatically forwarding an approval message to the subsequent approver in the approver list after the updating step. In contrast, the passages of Viswanath cited by the Office, while disclosing a matrix of approvers, shows all of the approvers in the same approver in-box window. Fig. 9. To this extent, Viswanath fails to disclose the hierarchical nature of the approvers in the claimed invention or the forwarding to a subsequent approver *after* the approval has been received by the approver and the approver list has been updated. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

With respect to the Office's other arguments regarding dependent claims, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are

allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIM 6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Viswanath and Okada, Applicants assert that Viswanath does not disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claim listed above. In addition, Applicants submit that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. However, for brevity, Applicants will forego addressing each of these rejections individually, but reserve the right to do so should it become necessary.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw its rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hunter E. Webb/

Date: January 15, 2010

Hunter E. Webb
Reg. No.: 54,593

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)